

INTERESTED PARTY [REDACTED]

Public hearing speech 21/4/26

Personal information removed

I want to begin by making one point absolutely clear: My objection is not to solar in principle. In fact I am an expert in sustainable healthcare. My objection is to the siting, scale and wholly disproportionate impact of this particular scheme on my home, my family and the surrounding environment.

My home was not properly recognised in the applicant's original plans as a domestic dwelling let alone comprising four separate family homes. That is not a minor detail. It means the true residential impact at this location was not properly understood from the outset.

We are not simply near this proposal. You can see from the plans that we are engulfed by it. The proposed solar arrays and associated infrastructure would enclose our 4 homes with panels, access routes, battery storage, fencing and operational equipment. This is not a marginal effect at the edge of a development. It is a direct and sustained industrialisation of the place where we live.

During a site visit, the project manager told us that, because of the intensity of the construction period, we may effectively be advised to leave our homes for months due to the noise and disruption. That is deeply troubling. This is not a case of temporary inconvenience. It is evidence that the many months of development are fundamentally incompatible with residential occupation during that period. Let alone for wildlife, skylarks, horses and farming stock.

The impact to our 4 homes has been described by the applicant as major and adverse and the proposed mitigation is wholly unconvincing. At the site visit, we were told mitigation would be sections of trees; in a subsequent email only hedgerows.

How can hedgerows possibly mitigate the visual dominance, construction noise, traffic, operational noise and cumulative impact of a utility-scale solar farm surrounding four family homes? We have also been told that any mitigation would have limited effect initially and that only by year 15 the impacts would start to reduce. That is not meaningful mitigation. That is an admission that harm remains for many, many years.

Alongside this another serious concern is our water safety. My family and others rely on a borehole for our drinking water. The Lime Down solar scheme involves extensive piling, trenching, ground disturbance and the installation of battery storage. That creates a real risk to groundwater. If our boreholes are contaminated, the damage is not temporary. It may be irreversible. Clean drinking water is not something that can be replaced by landscaping or offset by promises of mitigation. The application fails to demonstrate that our water supply can be safeguarded with certainty

I therefore respectfully ask that substantial weight be given to these harms, and that this application be refused.

Thank you.